UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,620	11/26/2003	Richard J. Melker	10457-125C	7104

29847 7590 11/30/2009

Beusse Wolter Sanks Mora & Maire
390 N. ORANGE AVENUE
SUITE 2500
ORLANDO, FL 32801

EXAMINER	
TURK, NEIL N	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1797	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/722,620	MELKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NEIL TURK	1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 July 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-27,29,30,32-35 and 37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-27,29,30,32-35 and 37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *26 November 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

This Office Action fully acknowledges Applicant's remarks filed on July 21st, 2009. Claims 1, 4-27, 29, 30, and 32-35, and 37* are pending. *Examiner notes that claims 35 and 37 have been newly added, but a claim 36 has been omitted.

Claim Objections

Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: The numbering of the newly added claims jumps from claim 35 to claim 37, while omitting claim 36. Examiner asserts that such numbering should be done sequentially. Appropriate correction is required. Examiner further notes that there are arguments presented specifically with respect to claim 36, but no such claim has been submitted herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 4-27, 29, 30, and 32-35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for providing a patient with a medication with an odorous marker additive and analyzing for the marker by way of electronic nose technology, does not reasonably provide enablement for providing a

patient with a medication comprising a combination of at least one active therapeutic agent and a marker, which is not chemically part of the active therapeutic agent itself, and analyzing the breath by utilizing an instrument adapted to detect the marker . The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make/use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicant's specification only provides enabling disclosure to the use of olfactory (odorous) markers and the use of electronic nose technology. Applicant's specification does not provide support for the use of any sort of marker that is detected by any such instrument adapted to detect the marker. Applicant's specification provides general narrative to the state of the art of many sensing technologies and generally discusses markers and medications, but does not relate all such elements and provide sufficient disclosure to show how such a method could be applied as currently claimed. Further, such sensing technologies have not been presented with respect to analysis of exhaled breath (see paragraph [0053]). Examiner further notes that, as claims 1 and 29 have been amended to recite "...analyzing the sample of patient's breath...to ascertain the presence or absence of said marker...***almost immediately*** after taking said medication" further points to the fact that not just any marker may be used for such analyzing, and notes that paragraph [0039] of Applicant's pre-grant publication relates such almost immediate detection with use of an electronic nose.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 4-27, 29, 30, and 32-35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "almost immediately" in claim 22 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "almost immediately" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Applicant's specification in the pre-grant publication US 20040081587 in paragraph [0039] recites, "Thus, when a drug is ingested by a patient, the preferred embodiment of the invention detects the presence of that therapeutic drug marker almost immediately in the exhaled breath of the patient (or possibly by requesting the patient to deliberately produce a burp) using an electronic nose of the invention. Here, a definite time period is not established by the specification for the relative term "almost immediately" and such a relative term is indefinitely recited. Examiner further notes that the claims have not provided the requisite use of an electronic nose as connected to such "almost immediate" detection. Does Applicant intend to claim a certain type of marker, such as a volatile organic compound, which, as a consequence, provides the capability for such almost immediate detection? Is such ability for immediate detection tied to the means of administering the drug? A combination of the two (marker type and administration technique)? Clarification is required.

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention. It is unclear what is meant by a Generally Recognized as Safe compound. Applicant's specification does not provide disclosure on what constitutes such a compound and it is thereby unclear what characteristics are necessary in classifying a compound as such, or if there is a finite list of such compounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 8, 9, 12-20, 23-27, 29, 32, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kell (5,776,783) in view of Katzman (5,962,335), hereafter Katzman.

Kell discloses a method for monitoring drug ingestion in a non-invasive manner (abstract; lines 19-22, col. 4). Kell discloses a quantitative compliance marker that is added to a medication (such as methadone), and the concentration of compliance marker and the metabolites (denoted as the marker as a combination of markers; compliance marker + metabolites thereof) of the quantitative compliance marker are measured in the urine sample and checked against expected baseline metabolite concentrations so as to indicate compliance or non-compliance in the taking of the medication. Kell discloses pharmacologically inert quantities of weakly acid medicines, such as benzodiazepine, can be used as quantitative compliance markers, whose concentration and concentration of metabolites thereof are to be measured. Kell discloses that the sample is analyzed using fluorescence polarization immunoassay (FPIA) technology, or other such standard analytical methods such as chromatography and other types of immunoassays may be used (abstract; lines 47-67, col. 4; lines 1-25, col. 5; col. 7; lines 45-67, col. 9; lines 25-45, col. 13; col. 14, including results/data tables to be shown to a person of interest (i.e. to be transmitted to the overseeing doctor, as in claims 16&17; lines 25-47, col. 16). With respect to claims 12-15 and 23-

25, Examiner asserts that the disclosure of Kell to the marker being applied to methadone, for example, is readily known to be given in liquid form (first reacts with enzymes in the mouth) and pill form (first reacts with stomach acids, as well as first absorbed in the gastrointestinal tract), as well as intravenously, and further methadone is capable of being administered intranasally, as a traditional pill form of methadone can be crushed into particulate form where it may then be administered intranasally (which also reads on the more broad term of taken via the lungs) .

Kell discloses analyzing urine samples from the patient and does not disclose analyzing breath samples from the patient. Kell discloses sensing technologies for analysis, but disclose analysis by a mass spectrometer.

Katzman discloses a breath test for detection of drug metabolism (abstract; columns 1&2). Katzman discloses that a safe and effective amount of the drug, isotopically-labelled is administered to a subject. Katzman discloses a breath test kit in which after a suitable amount of time the exhaled breath of the subject is analyzed to determine the concentration of a metabolite, which is then used to determine the rate of metabolism of the drug (abstract; lines 30-33). Katzman discloses sensing technology such as mass spectrometers for analyzing the patient's breath (lines 21-36, col. 7; lines 38-40, col. 8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine patient compliance in taking medication by applying the analysis of Kell to the patient's breath such as taught by Katzman. Kell discloses the need for monitoring patient compliance in non-invasive manners (lines 19-23, col. 4, for example One of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to test expelled breath because it would be non-invasive, safe, and is a method of sampling in which the likelihood of adulteration of the sample is almost null, thereby providing accurate results (Kell discloses adulteration of urine samples as a problem and incurring additional steps to assure proper samples; see col. 8, for example). Further, both Kell and Katzman contemplate detection of metabolites, and Katzman shows that metabolites may be detected in breath samples. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kell to analyze the breath sample using a mass spectrometer such as taught by Katzman, such that in the case of breath analysis the use of a mass spectrometer provides a suitable and accurate sensing mechanism for the marker of interest in the breath sample.

Claims 4, 5, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kell in view of Katzman as applied to claims 1, 8, 9, 12-20, 23-27, 29, 32 and 35 and in further view of Payne (WO 98/39470).

Kell/Katzman does not specifically disclose analyzing the patient's breath to confirm the presence of the marker by either semiconductor gas sensor technology or conductive polymer gas sensor technology. Kell/Katzman also does not specifically disclose capturing the sample of the patient's breath in a vessel prior to analysis.

Payne discloses a method of detecting conditions by analysis of gases or vapors. Payne discloses that the gas sensing device may comprise an array of semiconducting organic polymer gas sensors and the presence of any species present in the gas phase may be detected (pages 1-3). Payne shows that the sample of the patient's breath is

captured in tube 18 before being passed down to region 20 which contains the gas sensing device (fig. 1). Payne discloses that other types of gas sensors such as metal oxide semiconductor (MOS), quartz resonator or SAW devices, as well as mass spectrometry or a GC-MS device might be used (pages 3-5). Payne discloses that an array of such sensors are used so as to permit selective identification of a wide range of gases by recognizing the characteristic "fingerprint" of response across the array. Payne discloses that the output of the sensors correlates the output pattern (analyzed by analysis means 22) with the occurrence of certain conditions (page 4).

It would have been obvious to modify Kell/Katzman to test the breath sample with semiconducting gas sensors such as taught by Payne in order to provide dynamic sensing technology that may produce a characteristic response to correlate a condition in the patient's breath to the metabolites presence/absence. It would have also been obvious to modify Kell/Katzman to capture the patient's breath sample in a vessel prior to analysis such as taught by Payne so as to avoid contaminants in the atmosphere from interfering with the breath sample and allow to directly pass the sample to the sensing area.

Claims 6, 10, 11, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kell in view of Katzman as applied to claims 1, 8, 9, 12-20, 23-27, 29, 32 and 35 and in further view of Forester (4,762,719).

Kell/Katzman does not teach that the marker is selected from the group as recited in claim 6, and that the marker is an odorous compound and is provided as a

coating on the medication, wherein a substance to stimulate salivation is included with the marker as a coating.

Forester discloses a cough drop comprising a hard candy outer shell (coating, in which sucrose/corn syrup in the coating constitutes a substance to stimulate salivation) and a powdered centerfill, and discloses that the hard candy outer shell also contains menthol and eucalyptus as a liquid blend (abstract).

As methadone known to be given in pill form by Kell, adding the candy coating with menthol-eucalyptus to the pill such as taught by Forester is an obvious modification to Kell as it would make the methadone more amenable to be taken by the patient. Further, a candy coating with menthol is a widely-used flavoring, while also providing the implicit, added utility of a qualitative assessment in compliance/non-compliance in taking the medication by allowing an overseer/doctor to simply asses the patient's breath for the distinct odor of menthol.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kell in view of Katzman as applied to claims 1, 8, 9, 12-20, 23-27, 29, 32 and 35 above, and in further view of Guth (4,353,869).

Kell discloses several sensing technologies for analysis, but does not specifically disclose analysis by a spectrophotometer. Katzman discloses detectors for the exhaled breath, but does not specifically disclose analysis by a spectrophotometer.

Guth discloses a breath analysis device in which a photometer is utilized to

detect the analyte of interest in the subject's breath (abstract; lines 7-14, col. 2; lines 62-67, col. 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Kell/Katzman to analyze the breath sample using a photometer such as taught by Guth, such that in the case of breath analysis the use of a photometer provides a suitable and accurate sensing mechanism for the marker of interest in the breath sample.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kell in view of Katzman as applied to claims 1, 8, 9, 12-20, 23-27, 29, 32 and 35 above, and in further view of Ueda.

Kell/Katzman does not disclose dehumidifying the sample of the patient's breath prior to analysis.

Ueda discloses a method and device for expiratory air examination. Ueda teaches that an absorbing filter is provided for removing particulates and contaminants which would hinder the aimed examination. Ueda also discloses that a dehumidifying agent may be included partially in the absorbing filter (lines 11-62, col. 6).

It would have been obvious to modify Kell/Katzman to include dehumidifying the breath sample with a dehumidifying agent before analysis such as taught by Ueda so as to remove any moisture that may hinder the aimed examination.

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kell in view of Katzman as applied to claims 1, 8, 9, 12-20, 23-27, 29, 32 and 35 above.

Kell/Katzman does not disclose providing the marker/medication for the patient to take transdermally.

It would have been obvious to detect for the marker for a medication provided by any known means, such as transdermally. Whereas the concentration of the marker will be lower than that expected from a marker/medication provided to the lungs of a patient, for example, one of ordinary skill in the art would anticipate such and adjust accordingly to determine the presence/absence of the marker through transdermal application.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kell in view of Katzman as applied to claims 1, 8, 9, 12-20, 23-27, 29, 32 and 35 above.

Whereas Kell/Katzman does not specifically disclose a medication with more than one therapeutically active agent, it would have been obvious to apply the method of marker detection to a marker tied to any medication, including those which include more than one therapeutically active agent. This is seen as obvious, as Kell/Katzman is concerned with checking patient compliance in taking the medication, through detection of the added marker. Thereby, the method being applied to a medication with multiple therapeutically active agents is obvious as the method for detecting compliance/non-compliance will still be linked to the marker associated with such medication.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kell in view of Katzman as discussed above and in view of Phillip et al. (5,220,919), hereafter Phillips.

Kell/Katzman does not specifically disclose obtaining and analyzing the breath at the patient's home or other remote location and wherein the result are transmitted via a communication means for compliance monitoring.

Phillips discloses a blood alcohol monitor in which a portable blood alcohol monitor 102 is supplied to the subject and the subject connects a serial interface 108 between the monitor and a base system 104, so that the monitor may transfer readings to the base system. Phillips further discloses that the base system transmits these readings over a modem connection 110 to a modem 106 which sends the readings over a communications line 112 to a remote monitor 114 (lines 1-67, col. 4).

It would have been obvious to modify Kell/Katzman to have the obtaining and analyzing of the breath be done at the patient's home or other remote location such as taught by Phillips in order to provide the patient with the convenience of administering the initial test in the place of their choosing while avoiding transportation costs and/or other time (such as taking leave from one's work) losses incurred by traveling to the office. Further, it would have been obvious to have the results transmitted via a communication means for compliance monitoring such as taught by Phillips so that the doctor may still provide to check in the patient's compliance/non-compliance for taking the medication and do so in a convenient fashion in which actual office availability may be more flexibly utilized by the practitioner for other patients.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 4-9, 12-18, 20, 23-27 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 22-25, 29-31, and 34-42 of copending Application No. 11/097,647. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of the present application relates to a qualitative assessment for the marker in the patient's breath and claim 22 relates to a quantitative assessment of the patient's breath (with a sensor) for a marker that arises from an additive, such a difference does not constitute a patentable distinction as both provide medication/marker taken concurrently by a patient to check for compliance/non-compliance, and it is obvious to further check for an actual marker concentration with a

sensor in addition to the qualitative assessment so as to have a more accurate and complete check of compliance/non-compliance.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 21st, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regards to claims 1, 4-27, 29, 30, and 32-34 rejected under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph, Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant argues that the specification is replete with disclosure teaching that the marker can be any marker, including but not limited to odorous markers, and the electronic sensor technology can be an electronic nose, but is not limited to such a device.

Examiner argues that in all instances, even as the odorous markers are presented as preferable embodiments of the marker by using the terminology "such as" and "or the like", Applicant's specification does not provide teachings or disclosure to what other such markers may be used instead of the odorous markers as implied by the "such as" and "or the like" language.

Examiner further argues that, as claims 1 and 29 have been amended to recite, "...analyzing the sample of patient's breath...to ascertain the presence or absence of said marker...***almost immediately*** after taking said medication" further points to the fact that not just any marker may be used for such analyzing. Markers which would

result from metabolic processes, for example, would not appear to coincide with such ascertaining almost immediately after taking the medication. Thereby, Examiner argues that Applicant's scope of enablement should be in the least to a marker being an odorous or volatile organic compound and, at the most, the marker must be one that can be detectable in the breath almost immediately after taking the medication with the marker therewith. Here, there is a bounded range of markers that would provide for the scope of Applicant's claimed method. As currently recited, any such marker may be provided.

Applicant further argues that that the marker detection method of the present invention is intended to cover detection not only through the exhalation by a patient with a device utilizing electronic nose technology, but also other suitable technologies, such as gas chromatography, transcutaneous/transdermal detection, semiconductive gas sensors, mass spectrometers, IR or UV or visible or fluorescence spectrophotometers. This argument is not persuasive to enabling the claimed methods of claims 1 and 25 to be enabled for sensing technology outside of electronic noses. Claims 1 and 25 specifically provide for detection through exhaled breath, in which Applicant's cited disclosure, as provided above, discloses that marker detection through exhaled breath is accomplished by way of utilizing electronic nose technology. Additionally, as discussed above with respect to the amended recitation "analyzing...almost immediately after taking the medication", Applicant's disclosure does not provide clear teaching as to how such sensing technologies would provide for such immediate analysis of a patient's breath, as currently recited in claims 1 and 29. Examiner notes that, for example,

paragraph [0028] discusses capturing a patient's breath in a vessel for ***later*** analysis at a central instrument such as a mass spectrometer.

With regards to claims 1, 4-27, 30, and 32-34 rejected under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph as asserting that the claims contained new matter, such a rejection has been removed in view of Applicant's arguments and amendments made to the claims.

With regards to claims 1, 8, 9, 12-20, 23-27, 29, and 32 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kell in view of Katzman, Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant argues that Kell is restricted to examination of urine and monitoring of taking methadone by monitoring a compliance marker of benzodiazepine, and such a substance would not be volatile and would not be expected to appear on the breath. Applicant further argues that the immediacy of Kell is severely compromised such that a lag of about 1 week is required. Applicant thereby argues that Kell does not teach a method which in any sense provides even an approximation of real-time readout of patient compliance in taking a particular dosage of a particular medication at a prescribed time.

Examiner argues that the amended recitation to "almost immediately after taking said medication" is unclear and indefinitely recited under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, as discussed above. Further, the amended recitation of, "...analyzing the sample of the patient's breath...to ascertain the presence or absence of said marker...almost immediately after taking said medication" does not read over the combination of Kell in view of Katzman. Examiner argues that such a recitation does not require a particular

time period to elapse between administration and analysis, nor does it require a particular marker or means of administration of the medication which predicates certain timely availability for the ascertaining of the marker's presence/absence. Examiner asserts that even while Kell is disclosed for testing urine in time periods deemed by applicant to not be "almost immediate", Examiner argues that patient's urine samples are capable of being analyzed at any time after administration of the methadone. Whereas such test results may not provide an optimal confidence in the accuracy of such results, this does not preclude the urine samples from being tested as early as seconds after administration for the presence or absence of the marker. Examiner notes that such immediate analysis may be tied to both the type of marker utilized (a volatile organic compound) and the means of administration of the medication (such as intravenously) (see paragraph [0037]). Additionally, as in Kell, based on the analysis, the determination of a patient's compliance/non-compliance is determined almost immediately as claimed, as such an analysis reveals the result which indicates compliance or non-compliance.

Examiner further argues that the combination of Kell in view of Katzman is a proper combination in which the compliance marker(s), such as benzodiazepine and metabolites thereof could be detected in the breath. Examiner further argues that Katzman is not being provided for disclosing patient compliance in taking a prescribed medication, as Kell discloses such limitations. Both Kell and Katzman contemplate detection of metabolites, and Katzman shows that metabolites may be detected in breath samples. Additionally, Kell discloses the need for monitoring patient compliance

in non-invasive manners (lines 19-23, col. 4, for example One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to test expelled breath because it would be non-invasive, safe, and is a method of sampling in which the likelihood of adulteration of the sample is almost null, thereby providing accurate results (Kell discloses adulteration of urine samples as a problem and incurring additional steps to assure proper samples; see col. 8, for example).

Applicant argues that new claim 35 provides that the marker is a Generally Regarded as Safe compound, and the active pharmaceutical compound (benzodiazepine) of Kell is not a GRAS compound. Examiner argues that such a claim limitation is regarded as new matter in the claims and claim 35 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph as a result. Applicant's specification does not disclose of the marker being a GRAS compound as claimed. Additionally, as Applicant's specification does not provide disclosure for such GRAS compounds, it is unclear what constitutes a GRAS compound. Examiner asserts that benzodiazepine is generally regarded as safe as it is commonly known to be used for anti-anxiety and insomnia treatment in humans, among other medical applications, and within the present disclosure of Kell for human consumption, and is thereby rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kell in view of Katzman.

Applicant argues that new claim 37 distinguishes over Kell in view of Katzman, as a urine sample in Kell must be taken to a third party or laboratory. Examiner argues

that a new grounds of rejection has been applied over newly added claim 37 under 35 USC 103(a) over Kell in view of Katzman and in view of Phillips, as discussed above.

Applicant also argues that new claim 36 distinguisher over Kell in view of Katzman. Examiner notes that in the claims submitted on July 21st, 2009 claim 36 does not appear in the submission. As such, Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 36 are moot.

With regards to claims 4, 5, and 21 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kell in view of Katzman as discussed above and in view of Payne, Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant argues that even if Payne is adequate to cure the cited defect, Payne does not cure the defects noted above in the combination of Kell/Katzman. Examiner argues that, as discussed above, no such defects exist in the combination of Kell in view of Katzman, and thereby the combination of Kell in view of Katzman and in further view of Payne is maintained as proper.

With regards to claims 6, 10, 11, and 34 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kell in view of Katzman and in further view of Forester, Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant argues that even if Forester is adequate to cure the cited defect, Forester does not cure the defects noted above in the combination of Kell/Katzman. Examiner argues that, as discussed above, no such defects exist in the combination of Kell in view of Katzman, and thereby the combination of Kell in view of Katzman and in further view of Forester is maintained as proper.

With regard to claim 7 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kell in view of Katzman and in further view of Guth, Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant argues that even if Guth is adequate to cure the cited defect, Guth does not cure the defects noted above in the combination of Kell/Katzman. Examiner argues that, as discussed above, no such defects exist in the combination of Kell in view of Katzman, and thereby the combination of Kell in view of Katzman and in further view of Guth is maintained as proper.

With regard to claim 22 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kell in view of Katzman and in further view of Ueda, Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant argues that even if Ueda is adequate to cure the cited defect, Ueda does not cure the defects noted above in the combination of Kell/Katzman. Examiner argues that, as discussed above, no such defects exist in the combination of Kell in view of Katzman, and thereby the combination of Kell in view of Katzman and in further view of Ueda is maintained as proper.

With regard to claim 30 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kell in view of Katzman Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant argues that the rejection suffers from the same defect as does this combination of references when applied to claim 1 from which claim 30 depends. Examiner argues that, as discussed above, no such

defects exist in the combination of Kell in view of Katzman, and thereby the combination of Kell in view of Katzman and in further view of Ueda is maintained as proper.

With regard to claim 33 rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kell in view of Katzman Applicant traverses the rejection. Applicant argues that the combination is improper as Kell is only concerned with testing urine, which cannot provide information about time and dose, at least not in any degree of real-time nor with any degree of precision without having to back-calculate excretion rates and metabolism. Examiner argues that, as discussed above, no such defects exist in the combination of Kell in view of Katzman, and thereby the combination of Kell in view of Katzman and in further view of Ueda is maintained as proper. Examiner further argues that Applicant's arguments are not commensurate in scope with the claims as no such real-time detection and degree of precision have been claimed in the method.

The provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection has been maintained for the reasons discussed above in the body of the action.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL TURK whose telephone number is (571)272-8914. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-630.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NT

/Jill Warden/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797